



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 5

COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE
SUITE 1201
551 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10176

COPY MAILED

JUL 19 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:
Petteri HEINONEN et al	:
Application No. 09/923,255	: DECISION REFUSING STATUS
Filed: August 2, 2001	: UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)
Attorney Docket No. 2132-50PCON	:

This is in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a), filed April 15, 2002.

The petition is dismissed.

Rule 47 applicant is given TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this decision to reply, correcting the below-noted deficiencies. Any reply should be entitled "Request for Reconsideration of Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)," and should only address the deficiencies noted below, except that the reply may include an oath or declaration executed by the nonsigning inventor. **FAILURE TO RESPOND WILL RESULT IN ABANDONMENT OF THE APPLICATION.** Any extensions of time will be governed by 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) requires: (1) proof that the nonsigning inventor cannot be reached or refuses to sign the oath or declaration after having been presented with the application papers (specification, claims and drawings); (2) an acceptable oath or declaration in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 115 and 116; (3) the petition fee; and (4) a statement of the last known address of the nonsigning inventor. Applicant lacks item (1) set forth above.

As to item (1), rule 47 applicant must demonstrate with documented evidence that an inventor refuses to join in the application after having been presented with the application papers (specification, claims, drawings and oath or declaration). There

is no indication in the present case whether joint inventor Sami Oinonen was presented with a copy of the complete application papers for the instant nonprovisional application. From the evidence of record, it only appears that joint inventor Oinonen was presented with a copy of declaration and assignment. If joint inventor Oinonen was not presented with a copy of the application papers for the instant nonprovisional application, then Mr. Oinonen could not attest that he has "reviewed and understands the application papers" and could not execute the declaration he was requested to sign. Did inventor Oinonen receive a copy of the application papers? Unless petitioner can show that a copy of the application papers was presented to, or refused delivery by, inventor Oinonen, then petitioner will have to mail a copy of the complete application papers (specification, claims and drawings) to the last known address of joint inventor Oinonen. A cover letter of instructions should accompany the mailing of the application papers setting a deadline or a statement that no response will constitute a refusal. This sort of ultimatum lends support to a finding of refusal by conduct. **The proof of the pertinent events should be made by a statement of someone with firsthand knowledge of the events and should include documentary evidence, such as certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instructions, telegram, etc. See MPEP 409.03(d).**

Where there is an express or oral refusal, that fact, along with the time and place of the refusal, must be stated in an affidavit or declaration **by the party to whom the refusal was made**. Where there is a written refusal, a copy of the document(s) evidencing that refusal must be made part of the affidavit or declaration.

When it is concluded by the rule 47 applicant that an omitted inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in an affidavit or declaration. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the affidavit or declaration, such evidence must be submitted.

Whenever an omitted inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the affidavit or declaration.

In order to expedite consideration, petitioner may wish to submit the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) by facsimile transmission to the telephone number indicated below and to the attention of the undersigned.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 2327
Mail Stop DAC
Arlington, VA 22202

OR

Commissioner for Patents
Box DAC
Washington, D.C. 20231

By FAX: (703) 308-6916
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Crystal Plaza Four, Suite 3C23
2201 South Clark Place
Arlington, VA 22202

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-8680.



Frances Hicks
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy